



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/740,266

12/18/2003

Christian Auclair

1417-03

2270

35811

7590

05/09/2006

IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
1650 MARKET ST
SUITE 4900
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

FETTEROLF, BRANDON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/740,266

Applicant(s)

AUCLAIR ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 43-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The Election filed on February 23, 2006 in response to the Restriction Requirement of September 21/2005 has been entered. Applicant's election of Group XIX, claim 46, drawn to a method of treating or preventing Ewing's sarcoma comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition which stabilizes an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton has been acknowledged.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group XIX, claim 46, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that there is no burden at all on the Office to examine Groups XVI-XXX together, inasmuch as the restriction itself admits the lack of burden on the office. In particular, Applicants submit that the restriction recognizes that a search conducted for all of Groups XVI-XXX will be conducted in the same areas since all of the Groups XVI-XX have been classified in class 514, subclass 2, 44. Thus, Applicants argue that this is prima facie evidence of the lack of burden on the Patent Office in examining that portion of the Applicants' claims.

These arguments have been carefully considered and have been found persuasive.

As such, claims 43-45 and 46 have been rejoined with claim 46 for prosecution on the merits.

Claims 1-19 and 43-49 are currently pending

Claims 1-19 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 43-49 are currently under consideration.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 6/18/2001. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the French application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 12/18/0003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently

Art Unit: 1642

understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each reference listed that is not in the English language. Only references, which comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 are being considered by the examiner. A signed copy of the IDS is attached hereto.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, see for example, page 22, paragraph 0086. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

The specification is further objected to, Figure 8A, for improper disclosure of nucleotide sequences without a respective sequence identifier, i.e. SEQ ID NOs:. Hence, the disclosure fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825. In the absence of a sequence identifier for each sequence, Applicant must provide a computer readable form (CRF) copy of the sequence listing, an initial or substitute paper copy of the sequence listing, as well as any amendment directing its entry into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e-f) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

Claim Objections

Claims 43-47 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 43-47 are objected to for reciting “effective amount of a composition according to claim 1”. However, claim 1 has been withdrawn from consideration, as discussed above. As such, claims 43-47 will be examined to the extent that the claim reads on a method of treating or preventing Ewing’s sarcoma comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising an active agent which stabilizes an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or

Art Unit: 1642

with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims are inclusive of a genus of agents which stabilizes an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton. Therefore, the claims encompass a genus of molecules defined solely by its principal biological property, which is simply a wish to know the identity of any material with that biological property. However, the written description in this case only sets forth a zyxin protein, a nucleic acid molecule comprising cDNA of a zyxin gene, an antisense nucleic acid, a cell over expressing the zyxin gene and two inhibitors of cofilin as agents which stabilize the actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton.

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, "the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." (Federal register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3) and (see MPEP 2164).

The specification teaches (page 5, paragraph 0014 and 0017) that agents which stabilize the actin network of the cytoskeleton include, but are not limited to, compounds which induce overexpression of the zyxin gene in a cell comprising tumor phenotype and induces the phenotypic reversion of the cell into a normal phenotype or inhibitors of cofilin which is an enzyme known for its action on the depolymerization mechanism of actin F. For example, the specification teaches (page 9, paragraph 0036) that active agents which stabilize the actin network of the cytoskeleton of a cell include not only the zyxin protein, but also, a nucleic acid molecule comprising or constituted of the zyxin gene, or an antisense nucleic acid thereof, a cell or a set of cells over expressing the zyxin gene or a protein coded for a fragment thereof and an inhibitor of cofilin. With regards to the compounds which inhibit cofilin, the specification teaches that the compounds include, but are not

Art Unit: 1642

limited to, jasplakinolide or dolastatin 11 (page 30, paragraph 110). Thus, while the specification reasonably conveys the following agents which stabilize the actin network; zyxin protein, a nucleic acid molecule comprising or constituted of the zyxin gene, or an antisense nucleic acid thereof, a cell or a set of cells over expressing the zyxin gene or a protein coded for a fragment thereof and an inhibitor of cofilin such as jasplakinolide or dolastatin 11; the specification does not appear to be commensurate with the full scope of any and/or all agent which stabilizes the actin network because the specification has not disclosed any relevant, identifying characteristics, such as structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, sufficient to show possession of the claimed genus. A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or by describing structural features common the genus that "constitute a substantial portion of the genus." See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997): "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cNDA, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc., 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Enzo court adopted the standard that the written description requirement can be met by "show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristicsi.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. " *Id.* At 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613 (emphasis omitted, bracketed material in original).

The court has since clarified that this standard applies to compounds other than cDNAs. See University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., Inc., ___F.3d___, 2004 WL 260813, at *9 (Fed.Cir.Feb. 13, 2004). The instant specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features that are common to the genus. That is, the specification provides neither a representative number of compounds that encompass the genus of agents which stabilize the actin network, nor does it provide a description of structural features that are common to the compounds. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics

Art Unit: 1642

that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the disclosure is insufficient to describe the genus. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure(s) of the encompassed genus of agents which stabilize the actin network, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only a zyxin protein, a nucleic acid molecule comprising cDNA of a zyxin gene, an antisense nucleic acid, a cell over expressing the zyxin gene and two inhibitors of cofilin, but not the full breadth of the claims, meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Claims 43-49 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating Ewing’s sarcoma comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising dolastatin 11 and a method of treating hepatocarcinomas, mesenchymal tumors, neuroectodermal cancer, Ewing’s sarcoma and malignant hemopathies associated with chromosomal anomalies comprising

Art Unit: 1642

administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising a boroproline compound in combination with jasplakinolide, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating or preventing hepatocarcinomas, mesenchymal tumors, neuroectodermal cancer, Ewing's sarcoma and malignant hemopathies associated with chromosomal anomalies comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising any and/or all agents which stabilize an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in *Wands* states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the relative skill of those in the art, (3) the breadth of the claims, (4) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the state of the prior art, and (8) the predictability or unpredictability of the art.

Although the quantity of experimentation alone is not dispositive in a determination of whether the required experimentation is undue, this factor does play a central role. For example, a very limited quantity of experimentation may be undue in a fledgling art that is unpredictable where no guidance or working examples are provided in the specification and prior art, whereas the same amount of experimentation may not be undue when viewed in light of some guidance or a working example or the experimentation required is in a predictable established art. Conversely, a large quantity of experimentation would require a correspondingly greater quantum of guidance, predictability and skill in the art to overcome classification as undue experimentation. In *Wands*, the determination that undue experimentation was not required to make the claimed invention was

Art Unit: 1642

based primarily on the nature of the art, and the probability that the required experimentation would result in successfully obtaining the claimed invention. (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1406) Thus, a combination of factors which, when viewed together, would provide an artisan of ordinary skill in the art with an expectation of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation would preclude the classification of that experimentation as undue. A combination of Wands factors, which provide a very low likelihood of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation, however, would render the additional experimentation undue.

The nature of the invention

The claims are drawn to a method of treating or preventing hepatocarcinomas, mesenchymal tumors, neuroectodermal cancer, Ewing's sarcoma and malignant hemopathies associated with chromosomal anomalies comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising an active agent which stabilizes an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton. The invention is in a class of invention which the CAFC has characterized as "the unpredictable arts such as chemistry and biology." *Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

Level of skill in the art

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high, generally that of a PhD or MD.

The breadth of the claims

Applicants broadly claim a method of treating or preventing hepatocarcinomas, mesenchymal tumors, neuroectodermal cancer, Ewing's sarcoma and malignant hemopathies associated with chromosomal anomalies comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a composition comprising any and/or all an active agent which stabilizes an actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton. Thus, the claims could read on an in vivo method of inhibiting or preventing tumor growth and method of treating cancer by using gene therapy.

Quantity of experimentation

The quantity of experimentation in the areas of gene therapy for cancer and cancer prevention is extremely large given the unpredictability associated with treating a disease by a method of gene therapy, the lack of correlation of in vitro findings to in vivo success, and the fact that no known cure or preventive regimen is currently available for cancer.

Guidance in the specification and/or Presence of working examples

The specification teaches that pharmaceutical compositions for the treatment or prevention of tumoral pathology comprise an active agent which stabilizes the actin network of the cytoskeleton of a cell, wherein the agent includes, but is not limited to, a zyxin protein, a nucleic acid molecule comprising or constituted of the zyxin gene, a fragment thereof or their complementary sequence, or an antisense nucleic acid thereof, a cell or a set of cells over expressing the zyxin gene or a protein coded for a fragment thereof or an inhibitor of cofilin (page 9, paragraph 0036). The specification further teaches a pharmacological approach for the treatment of cancers by stabilization of the actin network, wherein NIH3T3 and EWS-Fli cells were contacted with dolastatin 11 or jasplakinolide and the polymerization of actin was measured by fluorescence (page 30, paragraph 0108-0110).

Furthermore, the specification teaches the toxicity of NIH3T3 and EWS-Fli cells contacted with dolastatin 11 (page 30, paragraph 0111). Specifically, the specification teaches the inhibition of EWS-Fli tumor growth in mice following administration of dolastatin 11 (page 31, paragraph 0112). Thus, while the specification clearly teaches the anti-tumor affect of dolastatin 11 on Ewing's sarcoma, the specification appears to be silent on the administration of any other agent, including a nucleic acid molecule, contemplated in the specification. Therefore, coupled with the unpredictability associated with correlating in vitro data to in vivo applicability, and using polynucleotides for the treatment or prevention of cancer, as underscored by the prior art below, the criticality of providing workable examples in an unpredictable art, such as gene therapy and in cancer therapy, is required for the practice of the instant invention.

The unpredictability of the art and the state of the prior art

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could recognize the unpredictability of treating a disease by a method of gene therapy. Gene therapy using

Art Unit: 1642

administration of recombinant nucleic acids involving *in vivo* or *ex vivo* methods had not seen any success despite a great deal of work and resources. Several reviews in the art show that difficulties with vector selection, mode of delivery and persistence of predictable and effective levels of expression of the protein, created technical barriers to the practice of gene therapy methods. Verma et al states that, “[t]he Achilles heel of gene therapy is gene delivery...”, and that, “most of the approaches suffer from poor efficiency of delivery and transient expression of the gene” (Verma et al. (1997) *Nature* Volume 389, page 239, column 3, paragraph 2). Marshall concurs, stating that, “difficulties in getting genes transferred efficiently to target cells- and getting them expressed-remain a nagging problem for the entire field”, and that “many problems must be solved before gene therapy will be useful for more than the rare application” (Marshall (1995) *Science*, Volume 269, page 1054, column 3, paragraph 2, and page 1055, column 1). Numerous factors complicate the gene therapy art which have not been shown to be overcome by routine experimentation. Eck et al. (Goodman & Gilman’s The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics (1996), 9th Edition, Chapter 5, McGraw-Hill, NY) explains, “the delivery of exogenous DNA and its processing by target cells requires the introduction of new pharmacokinetic paradigms beyond those that describe the conventional medicines in use today”. Eck et al teaches that with *in vivo* gene transfer, one must account for the fate of the DNA vector itself (volume of distribution, rate of clearance into the tissues, etc.), the *in vivo* consequences of altered gene expression and protein function, the fraction taken up by the target cell population, the trafficking of the genetic material within cellular organelles, the rate of degradation of the DNA, the level of mRNA produced, the stability of the mRNA produced, the amount and stability of the protein produced, and the protein’s compartmentalization within the cell or its secretory fate, once produced. These factors differ dramatically based on the vector used, the protein being produced and the disease being treated (see Eck et al, bridging pages 81-82). Also among the many factors that the art teaches affect efficient gene delivery and sustained gene expression are, immune responses and the identity of the promoter used to drive gene expression. Verma et al teaches, in reference to *ex vivo* methods, that weak promoters produce only low levels of therapeutically effective protein, and that only by using appropriate enhancer-promoter combinations can sustained levels of therapeutically effective protein be achieved (Verma et al, *supra*, page 240, column 2). Verma et al further warns that, “...the search for such combinations is a case of trial error for a given cell type” (Verma et al, *supra*, page

Art Unit: 1642

240, bridging sentence of columns 2-3). The state of the art is such that no correlation exists between successful expression of a gene and a therapeutic result (Ross et al, Human Gene Therapy, 1996, Volume 7, pages 1781-1790, see page 1789, column 1, first paragraph). Thus, the art at the time at the time of filing clearly establishes that expectation for achieving a desired therapeutic effect *in vivo* by expressing a therapeutic gene using any of the expression constructs known in the art was extremely low. More recently, Rubanyi (Mol. Aspects Med. (2001) 22:113-142) teaches that the problems described above remain unresolved. Rubanyi states, “[a]lthough theoretical advantages of [human gene therapy] are undisputable, so far [human gene therapy] has not delivered the promised results: convincing clinical efficacy could not be demonstrated yet in most of the trials conducted so far...” (page 113, paragraph 1). Among the technical hurdles that Rubanyi teaches remain to be overcome are problems with gene delivery vectors and improvement in gene expression control systems (see “3. Technical hurdles to be overcome in the future”, beginning on page 116 and continued through page 125). Furthermore, Juengst (British Medical Journal (2003) Volume 326, pages 1410-1411) teaches the unpredictable nature of gene therapy and that a few of the apparent successes actually developed T cell-acute lymphoblastic leukemia due to insertional mutagenesis at or near the LMO-2 gene causing altered gene expression. The art has demonstrated that a large amount of experimentation has already been performed without demonstrating successful gene therapy methods for treatment of disease.

With regard to the lack of correlation between *in vitro* and *in vivo* results, those of skill in the art recognize that *in vitro* assays and or cell-cultured based assays are generally useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the *in vivo* environment as compared to the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an *in vitro* assay does not permit a single extrapolation of *in vitro* assays to human diagnostic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. *In vitro* assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state. Furthermore it is well known in the art that cultured cells, over a period time, lose phenotypic characteristics associated with their normal counterpart cell type. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York, p4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a

Art Unit: 1642

three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences *In Vitro*). Further, although drawn specifically to cancer cells, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, 12:320) teaches that, "petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Further, Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not. Yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

With regards to preventing cancer, those of skill in the art recognize that reasonable guidance with respect to preventing any cancer relies on quantitative analysis from defined populations which have been successfully pre-screened and are predisposed to particular types of cancer. This type of data might be derived from widespread genetic analysis, cancer clusters, or family histories. The essential element towards the validation of a preventive therapeutic is the ability to test the drug on subjects monitored in advance of clinical cancer and *link* those results with subsequent histological confirmation of the presence or absence of disease. This irrefutable link between antecedent drug and subsequent knowledge of the prevention of the disease is the essence of a valid preventive agent. Further, a preventive administration also must assume that the therapeutic will be safe and tolerable for anyone susceptible to the disease. Further, treatment of cancer in general is at most unpredictable, as underscored by Gura (Science, v278, 1997, pp.1041-1042) who discusses the potential shortcomings of potential anti-cancer agents including extrapolating from in-vitro to in-vivo protocols, the problems of drug testing in knockout mice, and problems associated with clonogenic assays. Indeed, since formal screening began in 1955,

Art Unit: 1642

thousands of drugs have shown activity in either cell or animal models, but only 39 that are used exclusively for chemotherapy, as opposed to supportive care, have won approval from the FDA (page 1041, 1st column) wherein the fundamental problem in drug discovery for cancer is that the model systems are not predictive.

Conclusion

Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the large quantity of research required to define these unpredictable variables, the lack of guidance provided in the specification, the presence of a working example which does not address the issue of the efficacy of the control and the negative teachings in the prior art balanced only against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the method of the claim as written.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallner et al. (WO 00/71135, 2000) as evidenced by Posey et al. (J. Bio. Chem. 1999; 274: 4259-4265).

Wallner et al. teach a method of treating a tumor comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a boroprolin derivative in combination with Jasplakinolide (abstract, page 22, lines 27-30 and page 25, line 12). With regards to the tumor, the WO document teaches that the tumors to be treated include, but are not limited to, Ewing's sarcomas, mesenchymal neoplasms, neuroectodermal tumors, and hepatocellular carcinomas (page 16, line 14, and page 17, lines 3-10). Thus, while Wallner et al. do not specifically teach administration of Jasplakinolide alone, the transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements

Art Unit: 1642

or method steps. See, e.g., > Mars Inc. v. H.J. Heinz Co., 377 F.3d 1369, 1376, 71 USPQ2d 1837, 1843 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("like the term comprising,' the terms containing' and mixture' are open-ended."). As such, the claimed method does not appear to distinguish over the prior art teaching of the same or nearly the same method. Moreover, although Wallner et al. do not specifically teach that Jasplakinolide stabilizes the actin network of a cellular cytoskeleton, the claimed functional limitation would be an inherent property of the referenced method because as evidenced by Posey et al., Jasplakinolide stabilizes F-actin and promotes actin polymerization (abstract). Lastly, even though Wallner et al. do not specifically teach that the Ewing's sarcoma is associated with chromosomal anomalies of region 7q34/q35 of a zyxin gene, the claimed limitation would be an inherent property of the referenced method since the specification teaches that Ewing's sarcomas are characterized by having a chromosomal anomaly in the 7q34/q35 region of a zyxin gene (page 26, paragraph 0099). Thus, it does not appear that the claim language or limitation results in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure. See Bristol-Myers Squibb Company v. Ben Venue Laboratories 58 USPQ2d 1508 (CAFC 2001).

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 48-49 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 43-47. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Art Unit: 1642

Therefore, No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF


JEFFREY SIEW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER